UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,955	12/06/2004	Bernd Gromoll	1454.1586	8626
21171 STAAS & HA I	7590 02/10/200 SEY LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 700	RK AVENUE, N.W.	SCHEUERMANN, DAVID W		
WASHINGTO		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2834	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/516,955	GROMOLL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
DAVID W. SCHEUERMANN	2834	

	DAVID W. SCHEUERMANN	2834			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the conte	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying the			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	:				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 10. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered by the state of the date of the	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by		•			
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 					
13. Other:					
/D. W. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 2834	/Quyen Leung/ SPE, Art Unit 2834				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that, "Fechheimer, consequently, teaches away from modifying Fedei is proposed in the final Office Action, since Fechheimer seeks to employ a heat conveying medium with properties superior to those of air and hydrogen. It is submitted, therefore, the persons of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have modified Fedei is proposed in the final Office Action, since Fechheimer teaches away from employing air and hydrogen." The Examiner disagrees with this assertion because Fechheimer is used by the examiner merely to support the argument that it is obvious to replace the cooling gas (hydrogen) in Fedei with another well know cooling gas (air). Whether Fechheimer teaches away from using any cooling gas is not germaine to the argument. Applicant further asserts that, "Neither Fedei, Fechheimer, nor Koizumi teaches, discloses, or suggests a "coolant is circulated by a thermosiphon effect with boiling and vaporizing, the coolant being heated or partially vaporized in the discrete coolant areas and being flowing by natural convection without mechanically pumping," as recited in claim 21." The Examiner disagrees with this assertion because Koizumi clearly teaches this feature and the examiner gave ample motivation to combine the references. One skilled in the art would know how to circulate the cooling liquid in the combination without a pump by drawing on the three references for there various teachings. Accordingly, applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejection is maintained.